

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA *ex rel*,)
CLIFF BERGLUND,)
)
Plaintiff,) Civil No. 02-193-AS
)
v.) ORDER
)
THE BOEING COMPANY, INC.,)
)
Defendant.)

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA *ex rel*,
CLIFF BERGLUND,

Plaintiff,

V.

THE BOEING COMPANY, INC.,

Defendant.

Civil No. 02-193-AS

ORDER

David J. Hollander
HOLLANDER LEBENBAUM & GANNICOTT
1500 S.W. First Avenue, Suite 700
Portland, OR 97201-5860

Frederick M. Morgan, Jr.
VOLKEMA THOMAS, LPA
700 Walnut Street, Suite 400
Cincinnati, OH 54202

Neil J. Evans
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
1000 S.W. Third Avenue, Suite 600
Portland, OR 97204-2902

Attorneys for Plaintiff

Calvin L. Keith
Steve Y. Koh
Renee E. Starr
PERKINS COIE, LLP
1120 N.W. Couch Street, 10th Floor
Portland, OR 97209-4128

Attorneys for Defendant

JONES, Judge:

Magistrate Judge Donald C. Ashmanskas filed Findings and Recommendation (#118) on December 7, 2006, in the above entitled case. The matter is now before me pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). When either party objects to any portion of a magistrate judge's Findings and Recommendation, the district court must make a de novo determination of that portion of the magistrate judge's report. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore Business Machines, Inc., 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), cert. denied, 455 U.S. 920 (1982).

Defendant has timely filed objections. I have, therefore, given de novo review of Magistrate Judge Ashmanskas's rulings.

I find no error. Accordingly, I ADOPT Magistrate Judge Ashmanskas's Findings and Recommendation (#118), dated December 7, 2006, in its entirety. Defendant Boeing's motion (#98) to dismiss Count One of Relator's third amended complaint is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 5th day of February, 2007.

/s/ Robert E. Jones
ROBERT E. JONES
United States District Judge